

ARGUMENT — FROM — DEFAULT

A SIMPLE AND SHARP ARGUMENT
FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD



WRITTEN DOWN BY —
APOLOGIA ARCHIVE

McCarthy's Circumscription

Premise 1: When we see things around us, we **assume the default unless we have good reasons to think otherwise.**

Example: When we see a bird on the branch of a tree, we assume it can fly. But if additional information comes, maybe it will change our assumption. Because the default assumption is that birds usually fly and this is a bird, the bird can most likely fly. We have no reason to think it cannot fly.

Example: If we see a person on the street, we assume they can see and speak. We only change our assumption if additional information comes to conclude otherwise, like if they use hand gestures and signals to show they cannot speak.

Defeasibility Rule of Prevalence

Premise 2: In our world, what is demonstrable is that when things occur, things are usually explicable. When a camera dies or a car stops working, we assume there is an explanation because things usually have an explanation. The possibility of brutes is not discarded. But, **we assume things are explicable; we do not assume they are inexplicable unless we have good reasons to think so.** If a car stops working, we assume it has a mechanical problem. If we see a painting, we assume there is a painter.

Premise 3: When anything happens, even though the explanation might be unknown, the **default position is that there is an explanation unless we have reasons to think otherwise.** When things happen they are usually explicable. And we do not say they are inexplicable unless we have good reasons to think otherwise.

Transitional Conclusion: Therefore, the **default position is simply that there is an explanation.**

Is the Universe an Exception to the Rule of Explanations?

Premise 4: The universe exists is a true statement.

Premise 5: Either the universe's existence is explicable, or the universe's existence is inexplicable.

Premise 6: According to reason, we have no reason to think the universe is inexplicable.

Conclusion 1: Therefore, the universe is explicable.

What Kind of Explanation Accounts for the Existence of Reality?

Premise 7: There are two types of explanations:

1. Non-Contrastive: Just explains X.
2. Contrastive: Explains X instead of Y.

Premise 8: When reasoning, we prefer explanations with higher explanatory power, that offer a wider explanatory scope, and that are more virtuous than explanations that explain less and are less virtuous. Contrastive explanations are more virtuous and have a higher explanatory scope over non-contrastive explanations.

Conclusion 2: Therefore, according to reason, we have no reason to think the explanation of the universe is non-contrastive. We have all the reasons to think the explanation of the universe is contrastive—it explains why the universe exists instead of not, and why it is this way instead of any other way.

Why the Explanation Has to Be Necessary and Not Contingent

Premise 9: A contrastive explanation must be necessary (meaning it has to exist in every possible world). It cannot be contingent (meaning something that just happens to exist but could have failed to exist).

Reductio ad Absurdum

Assume the opposite is true: suppose the explanation of the universe is contingent. This means there is at least one world where the universe exists and the explanation does not. If the explanation does not exist, then it cannot possibly explain the world. Thus, assuming the explanation is contingent destroys its ability to actually explain the universe, which is an absurd contradiction.

Conclusion 3: Therefore, the **contrastive explanation must explain in every possible world** in order to contrastively explain the world. Therefore, there is a necessary explanation that explains the universe.

Why Can't the Universe Just Explain Itself?

Premise 10: Imagine a set called set C. Within set C, there are components A and B. In set C, if A explains B, it does NOT mean C is explained. The **whole set is yet to be explained.** Therefore, just because a constituent or a component is explained, it doesn't mean the set itself is explained.

Premise 11: **That which needs to be explained cannot itself explain.** Because it needs to be explained. Therefore, to say that which needs to be explained IS the explanation **doesn't actually mean anything.**

Conclusion 4: Therefore, the parts of the universe explaining each other **doesn't make the universe self-explicable.** The explanation must come from something outside the universe.

Final Conclusion

*By default, the universe must be explicable. That explanation must be contrastive, explaining why there is a universe instead of absolute nothingness. To do that, the explanation must be a necessary explanation that exists outside of the universe itself. And that is the core primitive notion of God in all theistic frameworks: that God is a necessary being that exists in every possible world and that explains reality and the universe. **Therefore, it has been demonstrated that God exists beyond any reasonable doubt...***